

**Summary Minutes
City Of Sedona
Citizens Steering Committee Meeting -
Sedona Community Plan Update
Community Plan Room, 1725 West S.R. 89A, Suite D, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, April 17, 2012 – 3:00 p.m.**

1. **Verification of Notice, Call to Order, and Roll Call. Members of the Citizens Steering Committee will attend either in person or by telephone, video or internet conferencing.**
Chairman Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Chairman Jon Thompson, Vice Chairman Rio Robson and Committee Members Mike Bower, Barbara Litrell - arrived at 3:08 p.m., Elemer Magaziner, Marty Losoff and John Sather. Jim Eaton, Angela LeFevre, Gerhard Mayer and Judy Reddington were excused.

Staff Present: Kathy Levin, Donna Puckett and Mike Raber

2. **Announcements from staff and committee.**

Mike Raber announced that the Planning Teams will be presenting on May 1st and there will probably be an opportunity for some tweaks based on the Committee's comments. We are looking to finalize their work by mid-May. Then, the Format Team can work on how the plan ideas get integrated into the larger alternatives, including the visions created in the last brainstorming session. Hopefully, we will wrap that up in June and once the "alternatives" are prepared, we will first get feedback from the Commissions, and then start doing neighborhood outreach around the end of June.

Chairman Thompson noted that Barbara Litrell joined the meeting at 3:08 p.m.

Mike Raber then indicated that the input meeting with the Fire District is next Wednesday and the meeting with Yavapai College and the School Board will be on May 7th. There is another update on the Parks & Rec. Master Plan on May 2nd for continued discussion on their model on community values, and on this Saturday in the Board of Supervisor's Room at the County Building in Cottonwood, there will be an open comment session on the Yavapai County Plan, for their 60-day review period. He hasn't looked at the plan yet, but that is from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Mike then referenced the copy of the article on the Arizona Background Report for the Arizona Town Hall, and indicated that in December, we were asked if we could provide an article on our Community Plan update and that was included in the packet. The Town Hall Meeting next week is on Civic Engagement, and we have a couple of testimonials from some Committee Members. It is titled "*Engagement in Action - Imagine Sedona 2020 and Beyond*" and Jim Eaton authored that article and the testimonials.

Mike then recognized Jim Eaton for putting the dividers together that are being used today. Additionally, Mike recognized Sara McGee and indicated that she will be leaving us; Kathy added that tomorrow is her last day and Mike explained that she accepted a job in San Mateo.

Kathy Levin reported that she has been meeting with the West Sedona School Student Body Council, and they have really enjoyed being asked to vision the future of Sedona. They have asked her to return after school to dedicate an hour to that, and they will continue to do that until they have exhausted their great ideas. There are about 15 students, including the officers and the delegates from the 7th and 8th grades. Only two participated in Elemer Magaziner's work, so it isn't redundant.

Marty Losoff indicated that there is a State Law that if the City is going to buy property for City use, there has to be a Land Development Plan in place, and the Housing Commission has been working on designating areas for affordable housing, so he suggested to John O'Brien that the plan be broadened, so it is not just affordable housing, in case the Committee indicates that the City should buy the Cultural Park, etc. Perhaps staff can talk with John O'Brien or John O'Brien can come to talk with the Committee before the City Council acts on it, to ensure it isn't limited to just affordable housing.

Barbara Litrell clarified that three elements are involved; one is the Housing Commission is working on a Land Acquisition Policy and that is a separate element that would encompass anything related to land acquisition. Then, the City has \$200,000 from In Lieu Fees that developers paid to the City and that is what the City is trying to spend, and in order to spend that, the City needs to designate the area that is considered in need of housing development -- forget the word "affordable", and that is kind of a separate concept, and that is what City Council's discussion was about, as to whether or not the areas designated for housing development were acceptable, etc., so there are a couple of different elements involved -- the Land Acquisition Policy that hasn't even come before P&Z or the City Council yet, and then the \$200,000 to spend and what the State requires to spend it, and the statute states that you have to designate areas in which it will be spent. If you had \$1 million, you might be able to designate Back O' Beyond, but with \$200,000, you likely would designate areas of land that might cost less.

Marty Losoff stated that it is shortsighted, like the Parks & Rec. consulting study, while we are doing the planning. If we are coming up with a plan to buy land for whatever purpose, and according to the law, it is not just for affordable housing or where, it could be for any part, and if we are going to recommend that the City buy whatever and we are putting the map together, let's include areas we are talking about. Barbara Litrell explained that the law that Mike cited relates specifically to affordable housing in the City, by buying land for affordable housing. It wasn't just a land development policy. Sandy Moriarty then stated that is correct; it only has to do with housing.

Chairman Thompson indicated that there is obviously some interest in Assembly Bill 207, which is another legal issue, so we will attempt to agendaize having the City Attorney. Mike Raber added that John O'Brien or Audree Juhlin might be alternatives to speak to both issues at the next meeting.

3. Adoption of minutes.

Tuesday, July 5, 2011; Monday, July 11, 2011; Wednesday, August 3, 2011; Tuesday, April 3, 2012

Chairman Thompson indicated that he would entertain a motion to accept the minutes listed above.

MOTION: Barbara Litrell so moved. Mike Bower seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed. (Eaton, LeFevre, Mayer and Reddington were excused.)

**4. Public forum for items not listed on the agenda – limit of three minutes per person. (Note that the Citizens Steering Committee may not discuss or make decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public).
(10 minutes for items 1- 3)**

Chairman Thompson opened the public forum and having no requests to speak, closed the public forum.

5. Presentation/Discussion on planning concept by Planning (Working) Team. (20 minutes 3:10 – 3:30 p.m.)

Chairman Thompson noted that two working teams were going to provide a preview ahead of the presentations in two weeks, to let the Committee know the kinds of things the teams are looking at

and how they are going about it. The Chairman then introduced Bobby Woods, the Architect and Leader of Team 3.

Team 3 Presentation by Bobby Woods: Bobby explained that the team initially looked at four sites and ended up looking at three of them -- Cor D' Amor, Cultural Park and "City Center" that for them was a center of the community with a lot of uses around it. Today, he will only be discussing Cor D' Amor and the Cultural Park.

Bobby explained that each week they would brainstorm as a group and they had a lot of little sketches, and then he or Norm Taylor would draw a little bit and return them to the group for more discussion. Then, Mike Bower came in and blew them away, so this will cover where the team is.

Regarding the Cultural Park, they thought of making that more of an education center with an emphasis on the arts, hospitality, farming and ranching, and one other area. He pointed out the location of Yavapai College and their film studies, and explained that they extended the area of the college with things like arts; general studies; music; performing arts; theatre; sustainability studies; and farming and ranching, with a possible connection to the Forest Service; a culinary school and a hospitality college. Bobby then identified the suggested inclusion of a commercial or public endeavor of a museum, possibly lodging with a B&B, and a restaurant that could serve the culinary school and hospitality college by using that facility to train.

Bobby then pointed out the existing theatre and indicated that a pretty big concept is to have multi-level parking, so they have a lot of parking on their site, including a couple of areas across the street in the existing parking lot of the high school. They would have a lot of parking and a lot of use, but also folks coming in from Cottonwood or visitors might park there and ride into town. Shuttle pick-ups are delineated and the team thought it would make sense to also have a mixed-use sustainable village with the education center, so it would have living, working and tourism, and that could support the outdoor activities at the Cultural Park.

Bobby indicated that behind the Cultural Park, there would be looser building structures used during concerts, like tents where vendors come in, and they are pretty flexible and mobile. He then identified a possible housing area and indicated that pretty much addressed that side of the road.

Bobby then explained the connection to the high school with the theatre, parking structures and possibly a Sedona-Oak Creek Information Center as you enter town. On the other side, they saw some type of commercial operation that would support all of their concept plus some of the timeshares and residential area too -- possibly a market and gas operation, etc., but the major commercial component would be an executive retreat center, so a high-end place with lodging and a great meeting place. The edge of the commercial land also has not too bad a view there, and there would be a little commercial on the adjacent side for whatever would be most useful for that neighborhood.

Bobby explained that the orange color depicts the connecting paths as ways to bring pedestrians into the areas and connect them, plus a pedestrian bridge located where it makes a stronger connection to the two schools and remains out of the view corridor.

Regarding Cor D' Amor, there is a residential area around the perimeter and the team thought that a little buffer would move into assisted living facilities. The roads shown exist now, so it would create a little island, and the team thought a high-end facility would offer more choices for the folks, and there are advantages to attracting folks that have more money to spend in Sedona. The core would be where the restaurants, assisted living, barber shop, library, cafeteria, etc., would be located in a central building, and housing where there could be two people living in a room, but as you move out from the core, you get to other choices, such as cottages or four townhouse-type places with one or two bedrooms, but they could still use the core resources and have their meals in or go to the cafeteria, etc. A third component might be single-family houses. It would be the type of thing where a unit passes to someone else when the current occupant passes, and it would be

the same with the homes, but it is higher-end and it would put people together with similar experiences.

Additionally, Bobby pointed out the proposed location of a combined recreation and rehabilitation center, which works well with the existing medical campus, and it could be shared with the neighborhood and the public. They have something similar in Cottonwood with the hospital and it is a nice environment with a great mix of people. Some of the other thoughts are to keep everything off of the hill and create a buffer to the existing neighborhood. There is a wash that could be used as a buffer and there could be an improved path along there to tie it back to a possible commercial node and the recreation center, and then loop back to the hospital campus.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he, Bobby Woods, Norm Taylor, Sandy Moriarty and Rod Abbott are on Team 3.

Mike Bower asked what the team saw as the center of the development at the Cultural Park and Bobby indicated it was the educational component of Yavapai College, and the other thing is to try to make it line up with what Sedona would like, such as arts, sustainability, hospitality, farming and ranching. Chairman Thompson added that it is mostly arts education; they tried to cover all of the major art education opportunities, but given the space, they felt they could also include sustainability and possibly hospitality.

John Sather stated that if you say this was a piece of Forest Service land that was taken out of the Forest Service's inventory for the purpose of total community use and there was great support for the amphitheater; however, that didn't work and it got into private hands, so is there any vested right with the land to say that there would be any commercial opportunity for the landowner beyond what the landowner has right now in what really is a community-only use?

Mike Raber explained that the existing zoning, which is what the amphitheater was built on, and the site plan that goes with that is what is vested and in existence right now. It includes kind of an arts village focus with the amphitheater and a performing arts facility. The hotel was not part of that; it was part of a Community Plan Amendment that was successful in 2006-2007 . . . John Sather interjected that his question is if that has any vested rights, because if we look at alternative futures for the town and say that we are debating a more community-developed aspect, a more tourism centric aspect or one that would be much more environmentally oriented, plus the two others we don't discuss -- stay the course or roll back, a major property like this manifests itself in different ways in each of those. In the environmental aspect, a potential would be for the City to buy it back to be restored to its Forest Service look and feel. Another would be in the community role with uses supported by the community, such as being educated in all of these various ways with some modicum of tourism. A third would be much more of a business venture and commercialized. He thinks this is a very good and well thought out concept, but he just wants to be certain that we believe we can get there with a recommendation like that and that it wouldn't be contrary to any vested rights.

Mike Raber indicated that he doesn't think it is contrary to anything that is vested. John Sather then indicated that the way the team has looked at it, it becomes a gateway piece that could solve the park and ride aspect and fulfill the Chautauqua discussions; they are either classrooms or linked pavilions like in the more Chautauqua educational theory, and he wouldn't say this should be another tourism presentation like we have on every street corner now, but perhaps an educational piece to a Sedona Red Rock Discovery Center-type of presentation to the region. As we go forward, he would like to test the ideas against if we are going to get ourselves in trouble, which is why he brought up the 207 discussion, and then test ideas like this in the public realm. Mike Raber explained that it is also worth noting what has transpired in terms of Plan Amendments too, where the Community Plan currently supports a much more aggressive scenario on the site. John Sather added that would be totally inappropriate under the environmental theory and Marty Losoff pointed out that of the 44 acres there, 22 acres are designated in the Plan, so the Plan would have to be amended. John Sather explained that the Plan will be amended by what we are doing.

Chairman Thompson indicated he was opening this discussion to Planning Team Members that are present.

Max Licher, member of Planning Team 4, indicated that there was a Plan Amendment, but no zone change, and that is where you vest rights. The Committee is going to create a new Plan that could completely change what they have at this point, if the community wants to do that, so they don't really have any vested rights in what is in the Community Plan now. John Sather indicated that he is really just trying to respect the owner's rights and ensure they are on the table for discussion, but the community also has a lot to say if we change those designations. Mike Raber added that we need to continue to expand that discussion as we go forward, to ensure everybody is aware of that.

Mike Bower indicated that a little case study like this might fit into the Committee's charge, which is the larger Community Plan vision, and this idea could easily fit into the Community focus with the emphasis on education and diverse housing opportunities. It could also slide into the Tourism focus idea, but it probably couldn't slide into the strong Environmental focus, so as we think about these, it doesn't have to be the ultimate vision. It is a case study that potentially doesn't even fit; he was expecting some teams to come back with something off the wall or not that relevant, but he sees good relevance and he would like to see a stronger graphic representation of the potential excitement that could build on a campus like that with more smaller performing venues for arts. We have the amphitheater, but there might be sculpture gardens or little performance spaces or more flexible exhibit spaces, etc.

Bobby indicated he had some there, but didn't mention it. Mike Bower then indicated that doing something graphically that evokes a bunch more ideas would be good. The tie to the school is graphically there, but it could be discussed more when it is presented again. The tie to a mixed-use development that centers on age-in-place housing is interesting, so possibly showing even the adjoining uses of the timeshare village, because that is a boat load of humans, and they have needs beyond some basics, so there is a market with those folks and the connection between the two parcels passes through there. He wants to understand more about the medical campus; he sees one medical building. Bobby indicated that they didn't do anything; there it is. Mike Bower suggested broadening the drawing to fill that in between the two and show what is on that medical campus -- is it a research facility, is it also a mixed-use development, how would a timeshare visitor wander down to get a haircut, etc., and why is the barber shop inside a big central building versus part of a community fabric of a shopping street. Those are just things from an architectural perspective that would start to tie it to things we have heard from the community about walkable neighborhoods and mixed-use things, etc., so if you want to continue evolving it prior to the next meeting, those are some things you could address.

Barbara Litrell asked if the team is looking at having an outdoor amphitheater and Bobby indicated that the group had a lot of ideas about the amphitheater, and they thought it would stay there, but they hadn't determined its final form in terms of size and how much would be covered, etc. It is still a nice use for the area, but how it ends up, it is what it is. Barbara then asked if there was an alternative to the amphitheater and Bobby stated that they thought it was nice and a great site for something like that; it was just that it might need to be reworked. There wasn't a lot of discussion about getting rid of it; he doesn't think anybody said that, but there was a lot of discussion about how it might be improved. Chairman Thompson added that it seemed to be a natural for the arts and arts education, and it is there, so let's fix it up.

Marty Losoff indicated that it was a good presentation, but he thought the question was to come up with a blue sky and not get into a lot of details. His team was focused on the big picture and how it ties to a lot of the discussions; they weren't going to be prepared to get into a lot of the details. John Sather stated that there isn't anything you would do wrong; it is thinking deeper on all of these and expressing it in whatever way you can. Marty then noted that in terms of going forward with our community meetings, etc., these presentations could be very exciting.

Paul Cate, member of Planning Team 1, indicated that his group is also looking at that area in-between the two, and their thought sort of compared with what Mike Bower mentioned, and some of their thoughts almost directly parallel what Team 3 is doing there, so it is interesting, and in partly focusing on the big picture there, it is sort of the western gateway and a critical point for what happens there, and the more excitement and diversity there the better. His question is that since you are going to be getting ideas from different groups, because he understands all four groups are looking at this area, he assumes the Committee will take all of the ideas and cull them however the Committee wishes, so it might be an idea from one group for the Cultural Park and one from another group perhaps for Cor D' Amor, so you might be able to mix and match them.

John Sather indicated that in terms of how we might use these and move forward in the presentations of the alternatives, from what he saw in a recent conference in Los Angeles, we could take a long poster and create a version of this that is storytelling, to present the big concepts, and then zero in on these, so ultimately all of this stuff is used in some way, as maybe little postage stamp details from a bigger plan, and then we can add to them and package them for the public.

Max Licher indicated he wouldn't see any issue with having two or three different visions for the same thing; it would almost make people aware that it is fluid and there are multiple ways things could evolve. Chairman Thompson added that it reinforces that the Committee isn't pushing a program; we are trying to relate what the public has said, and they have said different things. From the fact that they are similar in so many ways, he hopes that is an indication that they are springing from the same set of comments from the public. Paul Cate noted that the next level of that will be how the public input tends to compare; there are levels of input and we are at stage one.

Team 4 Presentation by Max Licher: Max indicated that he prepared a PowerPoint this morning, although they do have drawings similar to Team 3. Team 4 is working on several different things, but he is only going to present one of those. The team decided to look at the issue of neighborhood centers and discuss what might make neighborhoods more cohesive and what elements would be in neighborhood centers. Then, the team is going to focus on two or three different neighborhoods to show different examples of how a neighborhood center might develop within the context of its own neighborhood character.

Some of the elements the team thought might be appropriate or facilitate the notion of a neighborhood center include:

- Park/common greenspace - where people could gather
- Network of pedestrian connections - to get from various portions of the neighborhood to the common center or greenspace. People shouldn't be driving to the neighborhood center; the neighborhoods should be cohesive and walkable.
- Community garden/greenhouse - a function that would draw neighborhood residents together
- Meeting space (house, pavilion, etc.)
- Shade structure - might help give focus to what would happen in the neighborhood center
- Water feature
- Small market/café - depending on where the neighborhood is in relationship to more or less development
- Exercise facility - could also serve to be a focus

Max showed a sketch of somewhere else, from someone brainstorming about neighborhood centers, that depicts a common greenspace, community garden, little exercise loop and park benches, etc. Additionally, he presented some images showing different ways that neighborhood centers could evolve, such as by having an artistic gateway leading into a common space in the neighborhood, by having a central plaza gazebo with a little bit of commercial development and possibly some residential above, by having a little pocket park that could be at a little commercial center in the midst of a residential area, or by having a big green space in the midst of a housing development with benches, etc. Anyone of those could be a neighborhood center depending on the character of the neighborhood and where it is located within the community.

Max indicated that community gardens came up a lot, particularly in relationship to Schnebly Hill, and there is some tie to our historic past, plus the issue of sustainability and local self-reliance is pushing more people to be interested in gardening together. A catalyst for looking at a community center and community garden on Schnebly Hill is Steve Segner's two acres in the middle of the neighborhood, in that he has recently proposed to the City that he may want to open that up for a community garden. He has even gone ahead and started plowing, fencing and planting it himself, but we are exploring other potential involvement in it.

Max explained that Schnebly Hill is sort of unique in Sedona and it is his neighborhood, so that is one reason the team is working on it and they are also working on Elemer Magaziner's neighborhood, because they know those best and understand the issues and see the potentials too, and one of the character-defining things about Schnebly Hill is the fact that there is still open space. There are also a number of historic homes there and the current Community Plan mentions the historic ranch style.

Max indicated that there had been some mention of this in past planning efforts, so it was worth seeing what the current Community Plan said, as well as other planning efforts, and the current Sedona Community Plan recognizes the Schnebly Hill - Bear Wallow neighborhood as a Special Planning Area and the goals include:

- Preserve the historic ranch flavor, large parcels and low densities.
- Need for pedestrian improvements - walking on Schnebly is semi-dangerous, but a lot of people do it.
- Minimize auto traffic - which may be in conflict with the fact that it is the gateway to Schnebly Hill and the wilderness, jeep tours, etc.; however, it may be possible within the neighborhood.
- Any new development should be of a similar scale to the historic pattern.
- Retain affordable housing currently existing in Rancho Sedona Mobile Home Park.

Max then presented an overview of the neighborhood showing there is a fair amount of open space. Some is in orchards, lawns and gardens, while another part is just undeveloped land; however, it is a significant part of the experience as you drive up the road and it sets the visual character. He then explained that Rancho Sedona has not only affordable permanent housing for people who live in the trailers, but it is also a major RV park for visitors. Another interesting thing is the Creative Life Center, which is a seminar center and non-profit organization operating under a Conditional Use Permit that has been a very good neighbor. At the base, there is also the gallery district and as you go up Schnebly there are trailheads.

Max indicated that one of the primary issues recognized was that even though the Plan talks about large parcels and low density ranch style, the underlying zoning is the opposite with 10,000 sq. ft. lots, so if the current landowners wanted to subdivide and develop within their entitlements, there is nothing that could stop that.

John Sather asked if any of that is in the floodplain and Max indicated no and explained everything he is showing is above the 100-year flood mark, so all of that open space is easily developable. Max then explained that the primary thing the team wanted to do was figure out some way to achieve the goals and preclude that development from happening, because it doesn't fit the character of the neighborhood nor meet the current goals, and most of the property owners see their property as a future investment that would be developed to its highest and best use someday.

Max indicated that the team also decided to look at the Uptown Creek Area Plan and what that plan talked about included:

- An Artist in Residence Overlay Zone - the notion that anyone that owned the property could have a shop or gallery space, if they lived there, to allow them to have a commercial operation out of their residence.
- A Guesthouse Rental Overlay Zone - anyone could rent out a guesthouse as a way of getting affordable housing and increasing diversity in the neighborhoods.

- A creekside park
- New pedestrian paths
- Trailhead connection to the Forest Service
- A parking structure to deal with development issues
- A hillside preserve north of what is now the Creative Life Center property

From that, the team indicated that some of it is really good ideas, but some of it seems in conflict with where they would like to see it go and with the character expressed in the Community Plan -- namely the parking structure in the middle of things and possibly the location of the creekside park.

Max then showed where the proposed parking structure was drawn, noting that it is one of the key central properties with Bear Wallow at the end and Steve Segner's two acres on the north side of that. Max explained that the team created a drawing, and the team indicated that an agricultural/garden theme is the main neighborhood character, rather than just saying historic ranch style. Additionally, the community garden on Bear Wallow would become the heart of the neighborhood and the neighborhood center, and they would try to reinstate the historic ditch that goes through the property as a key feature. They would also look at Transfer and Development Rights to some different sort of mixed use, to preserve some of the agricultural open space.

On the drawing, Max then identified Steve Segner's piece and the currently undeveloped piece with a building, but keeping a lot of it green, and another green area the team is trying to maintain. Basically, the goal is that, as you come up the road, there is a primary sense of greenspace in an actively agricultural way.

Max indicated that in talking with Steve Segner as a property owner, he is potentially interested in doing a small three-way split that would keep two of the smallest possible lots, and then the bulk of it would become the community garden with a common pavilion, some worksheds, and the ditch reinstated to use for irrigation, and in return for keeping the open space, Max pointed out the possibility of some small houses, possibly for nightly rental as an adjunct to El Portal Inn. The income from doing that might help offset the development rights of six or seven lots, which is the other obvious future there.

Max explained that the mixed-use concepts for the neighborhood included:

- A creekside park closer to the roundabout than in the Uptown Plan
- A creekside nature café and B&B at the historic residence near the creekside park
- A Farmstay lodge for culinary retreats on one of the other agricultural properties
- Age-in-place housing
- Artist in Residence studio/gallery
- Nightly rentals for retreat/seminar users or people attending week-long seminars at the Creative Life Center or something at the Farmstay lodge could rent from other neighbors on a nightly basis, which is contrary to the current law, but it would make sense in this mixed-use, pedestrian neighborhood to minimize auto traffic, etc.

Max then pointed out the very first lot coming up Schnebly Hill Road that is currently undeveloped open space and indicated that the zoning could easily put three houses on the lot, so the team indicated that the creekside park and public access is more appropriate down there, jumping off of the Heart of Sedona Plan that showed one of the three hearts as a green on the creek with an open-air market, and that takes the Crystal Castle and builds new buildings along the street with a public space on the creek and some small pedestrian bridges to the islands, like in Red Rock State Park where they break away in a flood. Then, it would come over to the access off of Schnebly Hill that could form a loop. He then identified the location of the historic house that could be converted into the nature café/B&B with some creekside outdoor dining, so it seemed to make sense having it clustered at the base near the existing commercial activity.

Max then explained the three hearts in the Heart of Sedona Plan -- the plaza at the "Y", the market green, and the historic park on Brewer Road, to show the tie-in to what was presented in a previous blue sky plan.

Max explained that the team is still evolving the final drawing, but subsequent to the first drawing, the team understood that two things are potentially up for historic designation, in which case you wouldn't do what was suggested, but perhaps could build a new structure with some cabins that becomes a B&B that is tied to the little creekside café, and in return, that might be enough development rights to offset the other future scenario, which is about eight houses, and it maintains the public access to the creek and creates a really nice space for both residents and visitors.

Max then referenced the two other large undeveloped parcels and pointed out Steve Segner's community garden and community center; the Farmstay Inn with one-half to two-thirds of the acreage planted in vineyards or gardens or orchards, and the location for the age-in-place housing concept with parking underneath, that could be eight or nine residential lots. The question was what could be given to that property owner that would be motivating enough to keep two-thirds in open space and maintain public easements as paths through the property? The team thought perhaps a 10-unit country inn might be worth enough as an idea.

Similarly, Max referenced the Rancho Sedona property that is offset by 10 ft. to 15 ft. from the other property and is relatively level and a lower terrace, so it would be natural for parking underneath with a concept for age-in-place housing, where people would live in a walkable neighborhood with gardens, orchards, etc., and they could attend events at the Creative Life Center, etc.

Max indicated that in order to maintain the character envisioned, there are some infrastructure and implementation goals that include:

- A pedestrian path network partially off of Schnebly Hill Road; it shouldn't just be sidewalks on Schnebly, and easements are needed through property to follow some of the historic paths to make interesting and neighborhood-feeling paths.
- Some monument signage at the Schnebly Hill roundabout that identifies it as a semi-historic, pedestrian walking district and mixed-use neighborhood in the future.
- The City would participate financially and accept liability for public easements. In discussions with some property owners, like if the Creative Life Center opened its garden and trailhead connection to the public, they are more concerned about liability, so to make some of these things happen, the City would be in the position to potentially work out some arrangement where public liability during the open hours is taken over by the City, and rather than the City trying to exact community benefit out of developers, the City would say this is a good idea and we are going to participate with you to help with some of the infrastructure, if you want to move forward with that vision, and that is the attitude that the team would like to see.
- Different Engineering Standards:
 - Paver and gravel paths, not concrete curb and gutter
 - Narrow driveways
 - Revised parking standards, so you don't drive to the little home studio galleries; they don't have parking, but they are on a great pedestrian network.
 - Retain quirky stone retaining walls, etc., so we aren't doing new Engineering Department infrastructure in the neighborhood.

Max indicated that the overall vision is a little less than just residential, but the neighborhood isn't really all residential to begin with, and in order to preserve the quirky and somewhat historic feel, there are ways to do that, but they mean accepting some change, and hopefully, good and positive change.

Max then asked how the Committee is going to use these, or if there is going to be a big public presentation, how images can be discussed in the context of a large room of 100 people. Chairman Thompson explained that there is time between presentations on May 1st, so we can

have a good discussion to plan how they are going to be presented, and it is great that we have had two previews of different types, so we can get a good feel of how they might work.

Norm Taylor indicated that he had looked at the area, and in thinking about the creekwalk, he thought that the area south of the mobile homes and down to the floodplain would be an ideal place for the one and only large City park, because the City doesn't have a large park for events, and that area is the only one he could think of that puts tourists and residents on an equal footing, because a bridge could be built, and there could be a walkway coming down behind the buildings to a bridge that would go over to the park, so the tourists could come across the bridge, and he had suggested that the City should buy the building that is for sale, because it is kind of the gateway to the park. It is the park that he thinks the City needs somewhere for events.

Paul Cate indicated that Team 1 is also looking at a couple of sections of town, both into which they are incorporating sizable parks, so while that may be one location, there will be at least two others suggested, and it will be a question of how the ideas get used; however, those are more resident-oriented rather than tourist-oriented.

Max added that Team 4 wrestled with what is totally blue sky versus what is realistically possible, and they have met with a handful of the major property owners in that area to run this by them for feedback, and some of the ideas, as they have evolved, are based on what the team thinks might be more feasible. The City could obviously condemn something, but they got a sense of where the intransigents are and there are a few property owners that have made the creekwalk and some other things almost an impossibility, so they have tended to avoid a few things that they thought would make it less than realistic. They have limited themselves a little bit, but also tried to look at the best way to articulate the historic ranch agricultural theme. A park may be nice, but he isn't sure a big park, unless it had that type of theme, would further the theme as much as a Farmstay lodge with a vineyard, etc.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he wouldn't worry about what the property owners are saying at this point; the benefit of this is to have the public say whether or not they are crazy about that idea, and if they are, things can happen, and if property owners see that they are crazy about it, they can get crazy about it too. His own first reaction would be don't touch my stuff, until he hears more, so he would say push ahead.

Barbara Litrell thanked both teams and indicated that it is very exciting, and this is exactly what will get the public excited at the May meeting. It is the visuals and ideas, and people will start saying, "Please come to my neighborhood", because when you see what can be, that is what they expect from the next Community Plan. Mike Raber pointed out that Barbara is referring to the special event meeting, not the May 1st meeting.

John Sather also indicated that the teams did great work, but indicated that the point is this is exactly what should have happened from the time spent, and even if some come with different things, they are all powerful, but he wants to toss the timing of this overall plan on the table. We could use more of this kind of stuff, because we haven't been doing any planning, we have just been talking, and this is the real stuff. He thinks of the little pocket neighborhoods all over, and now you have one of the most unique places that really is a community and different, so it takes its time. At the American Planning Association conference, when you listen to some of the times spent on the General Plans, our timeframe is like nothing compared to what others have spent, and he wants more of this stuff.

Marty Losoff indicated that he hopes we show all of these things soon, but as a Committee, we still have to put it all together, as to the overall collective vision for the City. The first project could easily get into Tourism and Community, but we still have to decide what we want to be in the long-range. We know there are common things -- one stop parking, neighborhoods, community gardens, etc. that are common to all, but this is great.

Max indicated that this particular vision for Schnebly Hill probably fits into the same two scenarios that you are talking about, in that it works for the Community and Tourism scenarios, because it is an integration of both, and it is not total environmental preservation, but it is more than what current zoning would allow. The team's hope was that whatever the overall vision is, some version of that would integrate into it.

Mike Bower indicated that based on the picture showing what the current zoning would look like, the Plan states, "distinctive ranch style character", and that is what we are trying to improve upon, but he doesn't think any of us would generate anything close to the same for that. Zoning is an implementation strategy and the Plan is a vision that is supposed to guide you, so we have vague words guiding us and they aren't lined up with the implementation strategy, unless those little houses would be distinctive ranch style tract homes cramped together. We haven't really followed-up on a few properties that have zoning that doesn't line up with the Community Plan, and that has led to untold hours and efforts on the part of staff and private sector developers, etc., so we have to come up with an improved Plan, but at the same time, do something that gets us to a real vision, so we can do some actual implementation. He also wants to reinforce that these are tools, and the tools have purposes, but they are at odds with one another to this degree, and it is an example of the problem that we are really trying to fix.

Chairman Thompson thanked the teams again and indicated he can't wait for two weeks from today.

6. Discussion/possible action on selection of new member to Community Outreach Subcommittee. (5 minutes 3:30 – 3:35 p.m.)

Chairman Thompson explained that Angela LeFevre is running for office and has resigned from the Community Outreach Subcommittee, and we want to make sure we always have a quorum, so we want to replace her on the Subcommittee. He has been attending, but not participating, so he will throw his name in as being more than willing and eager to serve on that Subcommittee, and unless anyone has any objections, he will take Angela LeFevre's place on that Subcommittee.

MOTION: Marty Losoff so moved. Barbara Litrell seconded the motion. No vote was taken; however, by consensus, the Chairman stated that is done.

7. Discussion/possible action on the planning process and plan alternatives (concepts). (55 minutes 3:35 – 4:30 p.m.)

Chairman Thompson explained this was to be the meat of the meeting and he believes that we probably can defer agenda items 8, 9 and 10, if needed. For this agenda item, we all had the assignment to write visions for one or more of the alternatives, if we chose to do them. The ones received were included in the packet, so we have visions submitted by Rio, Jim Eaton did three, and there was a follow-up, so we added two more, which was an alternate vision for Tourism and a combined version basically keeping things the way they are, and Elemer Magaziner submitted his concept.

The Chairman indicated that the point of this is to discuss these visions and get a feel for what we like and don't like about what a vision should be, and then the Format Subcommittee will try to come up with three vision statements that would be resubmitted to the Committee for approval. Those vision statements would then be part of the presentation to the public.

Mike Bower distributed his three visions to the Committee and the Chairman suggested that Mike discuss his during the discussion, and then the Committee can read them afterwards. Mike then stated that he liked Rio's kick off of eight million visitors visiting Sedona -- that got his attention. In reality, something that Rio did was to get more regional, and the whole concept of maxing out our ability to be the super best of the best tourism place, tied to the airport idea, is really strong. It also reminds us that there is always going to be some regional ties to any of the ideas. For agriculture,

we don't have a lot of arable land within the City, but regionally we do, so he liked that a lot. In a way, it seemed like a first draft; there were some typos, etc., so he would recommend that Rio rewrite some more and even lengthen it a little. On Jim's, his feeling was a few of the things were as meaningful as "distinctive ranch style architecture", and one that comes to mind is "buildings are low and set back", which was in all three visions, and it doesn't tell him anything meaningful, but Jim's organization and consistency between them was really good, and all of them kind of addressed all of the key points in a nice way, and he thought that Jim nailed most of the citizen comments pretty well. He didn't get super excited about any of them, and in one way, we need to create excitement.

Mike Bower then added that in his experience of having done all three, it took him about six hours and it was a valuable experience, so those who haven't done it should still do it, because the Format Subcommittee is going to need to draw from 10 Community visions, 10 Environmental visions and 10 Tourism visions, to get all of the ideas. It may be that the written document is three pages instead of one, but that is okay, because from there if we take it into a graphic and get a large map to graphically represent some of the ideas, we will need more than just a few key ideas, and we will have enough detail density on a large map to get into a specific idea of a pedestrian bridge or community garden, etc.

Chairman Thompson asked Mike Bower if he sees that as part of the vision statement itself and Mike explained it is part of the process beyond the vision statements. We are individually writing these, and then we get to the subcommittee work of refining these vision statements, and then there are the plans, and he was describing the plans. When we graphically represent these visions, having plenty of ideas is good, because if we keep them at that scale, we can reflect a lot of great tourism ideas on that mapping scale. The purpose of writing all of these is to get you thinking, and he could finally see how to get some of it graphically drawn. He has known that we need to do it, but didn't know how we were going to do it; however, once you dive in and try to write it out, it gets easier to see something and some of the ideas will literally be able to be drawn.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he had assumed that we were talking about a vision statement that would be compelling, exciting and brief -- a quick memorable way to describe that overall thing, but there would be other details about that around; some would be moment plans and some would be just statements. Mike Bower indicated agreement, and the Chairman added that the job of the Format Subcommittee will be to come up with those brief statements, and then we still have the work of coming up with the other things. Like in Mike's visions, some things could be put in bubbles, but they wouldn't go in the middle where someone could quickly read what the concept is.

Mike Bower indicated that he wrote one page on each one and that isn't long. The Chairman pointed out that it is longer than a USA Today article, and if we want people to understand what the whole wall is about, it is important to have two paragraphs that say what the vision is, with just enough detail to make them feel that they know what it is about. Then, they are interested and want to read the other bubbles. Mike Bower explained that he was thinking that there might be a website or another newspaper like we did, where we could have even a three-page version of each of these. They wouldn't need to come to the meeting to absorb it in a two-hour session; it would be another way of educating ourselves, and for some, it might be their primary way of getting it, because they didn't make it to the meeting, etc., so he doesn't think he and the Chairman are at odds, but that they both are saying that there might be multi-pronged uses.

Marty Losoff indicated that he doesn't know if the Format Subcommittee can do it yet, because they aren't privy to all of the discussions; however, Mike Raber pointed out that the Format Team is here. Chairman Thompson, Elemer Magaziner and Jim Eaton are on it, plus Michael Hadley from P&Z. Marty Losoff then suggested that one way to create a collective vision . . . he didn't submit one, because he thought John Sather gave us the vision, when he outlined the five alternatives and to him that is the concept. It could be tweaked to make it more wow, but this is the overall concept of the three different scenarios. You could add another three or four paragraphs to accomplish the vision, such as the need for walking paths throughout the community, bridges, etc. Those are

common to all, but a vision statement doesn't need to be three to ten pages; it is not a book. Basically, it is one or two paragraphs.

Marty then suggested two or three Committee Members each take a different concept and come up with a vision for that, as opposed to the Format Subcommittee. Chairman Thompson explained the need to get these visions completed in a similar format, so they look like they are equally being proposed as alternatives. When different groups do them, there would be different formats, so they would need to be coalesced again.

John Sather indicated he is perplexed; he has pages of comments that aren't polished into that form, but he doesn't think his is enough. They were presented as separate basic concepts and Mike Bower has eloquently expanded upon them. In thinking about how we are going to roll this out, at the conference, there were 100 presentations of ideas, in the large poster form, that people were trying to put forth to the country or in little communities, so he looked at these and was photographing them in their graphic presentations, and then he watched people absorb them. Some people quickly looked it over and others read all of it, but they were all planner-types. You didn't need to read some of them; you got it by the big bullet messaging, but if someone wanted more information, they could go deeper. Regarding our next presentation, we all believe in these multiple presentations of alternatives, and if we developed a board for each of these, so the public meeting would be an overall presentation of the idea of the different alternatives and give a capsule of each of them that are on display, and have them roam the City for the next two months, so some people hang out and read them and tell their friends, and we advertise it, and have a way for people to comment on them, which eats up time into the summer; then, we evaluate them, sifting them up to this balanced vision.

John Sather then stated that what troubles him is that what he saw today excited him, because it went further than he had dreamed it would, and he wonders if we are ready to do this in May, because his thought was that we actually develop one of these. These could be printed out on a plotter machine for a map, and we could work to get these done. He personally has some real time issues, but he would like to be beyond a short vision statement of these three ideas and actually evolve them enough so the idea is really credible, as opposed to those that don't like tourism and those that hate Uptown immediately wiping out the tourism idea. If you read Mike Bower's tourism focus and blended it with some of what Rio said, and backed it up with photographs, big word messaging and some drawings, you might get somebody to reconsider what they think about tourism as this City's main driving focus, or all of the business owners in Uptown might say they don't want environmental, they need eight million people here, etc., so we could get some real thought going.

Elemer Magaziner indicated that a lot of maps are drawn of the City and a map of the process, but we need a map of what we mean by a plan. In thinking of the Format Subcommittee, he isn't thinking of content, etc., he is thinking of the format. We need a graphic format of what we mean by a plan, so when it is presented to the public, we need one thing for them to look at, but we haven't generated a picture of what we mean by a plan and of the information that goes in the plan. When he tries to explain to the public what we are doing, the confusing thing is what is a plan? We have lots of words to describe a plan, but everybody has a different interpretation. Somebody has to draw a picture of what we are doing with all of this information. He mentioned this a year ago, because when you get to a 15-word vision statement, everyone will interpret it differently and it is too vague. When you get to a picture of what you are going to do, it eliminates other possibilities, so there is like a scale from very vague and inclusive of lots of different ideas to one that excludes ideas, so just a simple picture to give people an idea of what we are trying to build, some kind of conceptual picture . . . John Sather indicated he is missing what Elemer is saying, because what Mike Bower just put up is showing that; the document will have a map like that.

Mike Bower explained that Elemer is talking about if it has tabs that stick out from the edge, if it is done in the format of chapters, a mind map, webs of information, if you read it in the format of a patterned language, etc. It is the format of the document itself; will it be a linear book that you read

through, and he is right, that needs to be done, but jumping back to John's excellent timing of bringing us those pictures of a presentation that he just scanned, there are lots of words there, but what we are talking about is still lots of words. He started to think that perhaps he and Chairman Thompson weren't on the same page, but the words don't have to be all in one big vision statement. The words all have to be there, because the vision statement has to be more than bullet points; it almost has to be a "day in the life of" style. We have to write as though we are in the future; otherwise, everybody reverts to tomorrow and that isn't viable.

Chairman Thompson asked if Mike Bower can imagine a vision statement that is two succinct paragraphs that are exciting and compelling, that we can put in the middle, so people can quickly read it and see what it is, and then it continue for more paragraphs that support that with detail about the walking paths, etc., as descriptions of the different bubbles that will be around it. Mike Bower indicated yes, or he could just say that all of these words are the basic vision and it doesn't continue, but all of the key components are all of the other things we need to write about, so it is a little more than two paragraphs. We are going to potentially trot these out in displays that we move around, etc., so they are almost self-operating presentations, because we need to do a lot of broad outreach to excite people and bring them out to do the ultimate blue dot game. He put this example up to get us thinking that we are heading toward something like what John Sather described, and the use of those will be in trotting them out to the public. We may be there in some meetings or leave them alone at schools, etc.

Mike Bower added that he thinks what the Chairman is saying that a big, key, simple two paragraphs is what people can come and get if they don't have much time, and he is in 100% agreement with that, but he is also saying to write a little more, if they do have more time to get into it, and it could just be the key components.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he wanted to try one more time and explained what he sees as the short two paragraphs and all of the examples about it, and then how it could be presented for people that can't see all of that, such as on the website. Barbara Litrell referenced Mike Bower's visions and indicated that her first impression was that the top part in bold was the vision statement, and everything under it is the explanation and supporting information of the vision, so there will be the main vision statement for each one of these, and the narrative can either be put into the map form or be woven into a board form with visuals, but it just needs to be tweaked and expanded.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he thinks we have enough to write the two paragraphs, because we have enough of the supporting detail to know where to go with it, so we can write the two exciting paragraphs about each of the three, and we can start to list more detail as bullets now and make them into paragraphs later, but we don't know what all of them will be yet. Moment plans will cover some of them and some will be concepts by themselves, and as more are developed, we will fill out the stuff below, so by the time it is presented, we will have a good two pages worth or the chart, etc. The Format Subcommittee can write the two paragraphs and start listing the details we know now.

Barbara Litrell indicated that narrative is important to communicate the emotion of a concept and Mike Raber agreed that we don't want just bullet points. Barbara added that bullet points or two words in a box doesn't excite and the narrative, with photographs, etc., can use words that appeal to emotions that people identify with, and that is why she liked what was shown with pictures combined with narrative.

John Sather indicated that if you just diagrammed one of these like that, you could take Mike Bower's paragraphs, they could be in that format, and then add photographs or sketches of what you haven't drawn. Barbara agreed that you can do it that way or also with narrative, so someone who wants to take the time to read can read them and identify with them. We need more than just "pedestrian walkways". Chairman Thompson explained that he misspoke when he said bullet points, because he felt that they would be narrative.

Elemer Magaziner indicated that for the last 15 minutes, the Committee has been saying words about all of the pieces -- narrative, bullet points, pictures, etc., but we haven't drawn a picture of all of the stuff we are talking about. We are just throwing it around helter skelter, and that is what he means by format. We will have narrative, bullet points, very brief blah blahs, but we haven't taken the time to draw a picture of how they all fit together and how they are laid out. Elemer added that John Sather brought up some example used by somebody else, but we aren't creating a picture of all of the different pieces and how they are going to fit together, and that would make things a lot easier if we figure out how to link these things together.

Marty Losoff indicated that his vision for Tourism is that we accept tourism as our main economic engine, and in doing so, strive to be in the category of the best of the best, as it relates to hosting visitors. In order to accomplish this, we can have more easy access to the creek, and then he would show a picture, and we would have tourism coming in from one gateway, and at the Cultural Park have a picture that would show general parking, the shuttle system and how to get from there to the Main Street area. Coming down 89A, it would stop at what is now Basha's shopping center, and he would call that the "Entertainment District". He would show pictures of a movie theater, concert hall perhaps, restaurants -- a quality entertainment district at four corners. Going further, it would show Main Street, and he would offer taking out Main Street -- don't have it anymore, put the high-scale shopping area in the Cultural Park or Hillside shopping center, and Main Street would become just a thoroughfare to the canyon that is a nice boulevard. For the tourists coming down the canyon, he would show a picture of the Preserves that the City would buy and develop into a festival area with open space -- two days a week with music and arts, two days a week with a farmer's market and two days a week with whatever, but it is ongoing for pedestrians, visitors and residents. That is the kind of thing we've been talking about -- pictures, but the idea is that we are embracing tourism as our economic engine and accepting that it is driving the City. The other option would be Community, but that is how he would start all of this stuff without getting hung up on all of the format, bullet points, etc. We are accepting as our goal and objective that for the next 20 years tourism is going to drive us, then substitute Tourism for Community, but that is how we start moving forward.

Chairman Thompson stated that the vision statement could be basically a line instead of two paragraphs, and then you have all of the supporting details. Mike Bower noted that Marty just figured out a way to get Donna Puckett to write his paper for him, because he filled out some really interesting ideas and she took notes. Mike then explained that when he started writing his, he couldn't put everything on a page, so he recognized that some of the ideas he had weren't his favorites, so he put the things that he wanted to focus on. He didn't touch upon some of the key parcels in some, but in others he did, so his advocacy for all Committee Members is that everybody should do it. He appreciated Elemer's, but it is a list of goals again, and it is the Community vision, the way he read it -- not Tourism or Environmental. Mike then encouraged Elemer to do Tourism and Environmental, and if we all do that, when we get to the level of pulling these together, we will have more raw data and with everybody having gone through the experience, we will be more humbled or excited to do a little less grandstanding and phonetic worry discussion and have more positivity. He was happy that he did it.

John Sather indicated that he frankly thinks we are all saying the same thing and Mike Bower indicated he agreed with Chairman Thompson's comment that the Format Subcommittee can start writing succinct paragraphs that go with each of these, but he doesn't think that we are edging past the big bubble that says "individual Committee visions" right now. Chairman Thompson stated that people can do the writing on their own and compare that with what we come up with, and that will make it easier to find the holes in what we did. Mike Bower suggested that Committee Members read and critique his and the others, and just add what they want, if they don't want to craft all of it. Add the things you think he missed or line out the things you think are off base, because that reflects your feeling about it, and he would also suggest that staff do this too, because Mike and Kathy have perspectives that we don't have.

Chairman Thompson noted that the time is 5:05 p.m., and there are two other items, so his hope would be to extend the meeting to 5:30 p.m. Mike Raber indicated that he would have to leave and noted that we have to discuss agenda item 8. The Chairman then indicated that information for agenda item 9 will be sent by email, because Barbara Litrell did some good work on that.

8. Discussion/possible action on Community Plan event on May 14, 2012. (15 minutes 4:30 – 4:45 p.m.)

Mike Raber explained that the Outreach Subcommittee has been working on this interim event to ensure the public is aware that we are still here and moving forward, and basically the idea is to let them know where we are in the process, where we are going, what we have heard and what the Planning Teams have been doing, and we may need to talk about the ideas that are emerging. Then, we would explain the general idea behind the next step with the plan alternatives. We also talked about the outline structure for the meeting, but not in detail. Jim Eaton created a good opening video that we can show, but we haven't talked much about what the presentation will look like and who will be involved, but the date is May 14th, so we need to discuss that. Kathy Levin added that there is a citywide mailer scheduled to go to the printer on Friday.

John Sather indicated that another option is that he wants to do these presentations with such care that they become very powerful, so people remember the choices, etc., and we could do the 14th without rolling these out. Chairman Thompson explained that the concept of the 14th would be a status report and John Sather indicated that he is fine with that and we might have a couple of these, like a couple of Max's slides to say these are what the Planning Teams are working on, just to give them the idea that there is some real detail coming and to get them excited about what is going to be happening in their neighborhoods. We could delay the neighborhood things until July.

John Sather asked if we would talk about the variations to get that idea out and Mike Raber indicated yes, to at least let them understand the concept. Chairman Thompson added that the idea would be to rely on John Sather to explain . . . John Sather indicated that thinking about his availability and wanting to sink his teeth in when these are finally done, the whole next piece could become very meaningful if we had the time. Chairman Thompson stated that we have time to consider what the timing should be on those presentations, but he thinks we should go ahead with the May 14th meeting as a way to let the public know, because since November, they have no idea what is going on, and to get the idea of the alternatives in their head and position it, so they are starting to think the right way about them, rather than voting for one or the other.

Marty Losoff indicated that he assumed it would be a progress report that would show all the thoughts we had. We have condensed them now, and then secondarily, have the three concepts and discuss them a little bit. Chairman Thompson agreed that introducing the concepts is key. Marty Losoff added that we could show a few of these pictures, and when you look at some of the earlier plans, etc., there are some wonderful things in there and we could almost copy some of that, to let the community know that we have been working on something.

Chairman Thompson noted that it is a social event too, because we are going to feed them, etc. Elemer Magaziner indicated that Chuck Adams on Team 4 wrote an idea for Uptown, where Jordan Road and 89A split, making a mall and all kinds of stuff, but he also listed all of the citizen ideas that were implemented with his drawing. Chuck is the only one he has seen do that explicitly, and as a status report to the community, they gave all of these ideas, so show what we have done with them. He wrote Chuck back saying it was incredible, because he has an idea and he actually covered like 23 citizen ideas with pictures of how they might work, and that is what he would want to know if he had come to the meetings.

Barbara Litrell asked if that would be doable for all four teams to show what could happen and Mike Bower indicated that the Committee will find out on May 1st. Mike Raber expressed the need to be careful about how we trot out the moment plans, when we don't have everything put together, but the idea of having that connection for the ones we used is a good one.

Mike Bower noted that Mr. Perkins from the Cultural Park was here today and he would assume that he might be a little concerned about what he heard and saw, and our goal is not to create a buzz that hurts us, but at the same time, we can selectively see what we get on May 1st and pick the stuff that works well, and he understands the concept of the May 14th meeting, but what would be the citizen participatory aspect of it, if anything . . . just some dialogue afterwards?

Mike Raber explained that in the last meeting, he heard that it was not to be an input session. Mike Bower then indicated that it seems like a status report as a big presentation is a little wishy-washy; it may be better suited to the mailing itself, because if he and John did something, we would be dancing on thin ice by either talking about what is already disrupting us in the difficulty in understanding the three alternatives versus what the Planning Teams are doing, and to do that in front of the public could be a little dicey, but on the other hand, he could see explaining that we are hearing these three themes and here is the distillation of your comments, although lots of people's have disappeared . . . it is Jim's distillation of those comments. There are some things he personally loves that are gone, but he isn't making a big deal out of it, because it doesn't bother him, but we could find that the whole meeting is just taking us backwards.

John Sather indicated that if we tried to put out some mailer, it would have to be created in the right messaging, but it would save pulling a meeting together; how would it be distributed? Kathy Levin indicated that it is a tri-fold that is mailed. Mike Raber then asked how committed the Committee is on the meeting; we have reserved the space. Chairman Thompson stated that we are billing it as a status report, but one of the key things he thought was that the alternatives need to be properly explained, so people don't jump to the conclusion that they are to be voted on, etc., and he wouldn't want to do that in writing.

John Sather indicated that he wanted to debate whether we are talking about three alternatives or five. Chairman Thompson stated three; it has been decided by the Committee. Mike Bower added that John Sather is the only one hanging onto five. John Sather then added that we are going down a path to explore three alternative futures; he is not sure how those play into this, but that is an exercise that after May 1st, there should be enough meat there, so you could scan or photograph those and have them in the room -- so there might be enough, but he wouldn't expect a lot from the meeting.

Barbara Litrell asked if the mailer is just telling people about the meeting and Mike Raber indicated yes. John Sather explained that he is trying to determine if we could put more meat in it, so he would get the idea if he didn't come to the meeting. Mike Raber indicated that we could if we weren't doing it on May 14th.

Marty Losoff stated okay, so people come and think big deal, they have been through it before, and so what is the next step. He then asked if there could be a vehicle for participants to give some feedback, without it being a vote and Mike Raber stated sure. Mike Bower then indicated that we should be careful about it and May 14th comes fast. He and John Sather would only get to meet once before then, so he is inclined to do something that would be a presentation that says here is where we were, here is some distillation of that, here is how we have seen that break out, and say that we are starting to see these three sides. He has had pretty good play when explaining that to his friends, because the town breaks into some business folks that argue for more billboards and tourism, and people that are for a no-growth environment, etc., and then there is the group that is about Sedonons versus the Tourons and we have given the Tourons way too much, and we all hold a little of each, so we have realized that none of these is really the ultimate vision for our town, but in order to jump from the comments to our ultimate vision, we are going to explore these different focuses.

Chairman Thompson explained that Mike Bower and John Sather don't have to talk about what we have done so far; we are talking about Mike Raber and him summarizing the past and talking about the comments, and we can figure out a way to frame that the comments were distilled, etc. Then, we would toss it to Mike Bower and John Sather to say that we have turned it into some alternative

visions; then you can talk about Branson, Big Sur, etc., which he related to as a good technique for people to know what an extreme would be. We could give them some teasers and tell them that at the end of June or July, we will be coming around to the communities; then, they can be excited about that happening.

John Sather indicated he is fine if somebody can pull the show together, because of his time limitations. Donna Puckett pointed out that when a location is named, some people focus on how they hate that location and totally miss the message; however, the Chairman indicated that exactly serves the purpose, because they know they wouldn't want to be that. Mike Bower pointed out that Anita MacFarlane was in a meeting and advocated that we not let any humans near the creek, because they are destroying the creek and that the creekwalk is a terrible idea, and that represents the Environment focus, as it relates to the creek, and that is probably a pretty valid concern, but it is a focus. Then, we have Rio who is talking about more creek access everywhere, because the visitors love that; we don't have to use Branson or Big Sur, because we can draw from the very comments that we are focusing the meeting on and say this is why we feel that it is intelligent to explore these three different focuses. He sees how to get us there; his concern is that John Sather will help present, but he (Mike) has to get us there and we want to make it evocative, dive into some of the pictures and have a PowerPoint, without committing to anything that somebody could latch onto, because we will find out May 1st how valid some of this is going to be, and we might need to get back with the landowners and ask if we put this in front of the public, whether or not they will freak out. Max has pretty much vetted his neighborhood and they are okay with what he has.

Elemer Magaziner added that he also vetted his and found that if you use an existing street, people that live on cul-de-sacs don't want that as an access to another part of the neighborhood, but they would love to remove utility lines and trade them for pathways, so there are all of those sensitivities.

9. Discussion/possible action on "neighborhood tour field trip" by the Citizens Steering Committee. (10 minutes 4:45 – 4:55 p.m.)

Chairman Thompson indicated that there are good plans and that will be communicated by email. Kathy Levin added that it would be on May 15th and Chairman Thompson suggested that they keep the afternoon open; we may meet at the parking lot at the Cultural Park.

**10. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items. (5 minutes 4:55 – 5:00 p.m.)
Tuesday, May 1, 2012
Tuesday, May 15, 2012**

Chairman Thompson asked if there were any issues regarding the future meeting dates and agenda items and Barbara Litrell asked if a vehicle was rented for the 15th. Chairman Thompson indicated that needed to be done, but we wanted to make sure we had a rough plan.

11. Adjournment.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 5:26 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Citizens Steering Committee held on April 17, 2012.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date